



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/565,729	07/27/2006	Jon Grant	124316.00102	1941
27557 7590 02/20/2008				
BLANK ROME LLP				
600 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVENUE, N.W.				
WASHINGTON, DC 20037				
EXAMINER				
SKURDAL, COREY NELSON				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3782				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
02/20/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/565,729

Applicant(s)

GRANT, JON

Examiner

COREY N. SKURDAL

Art Unit

3782

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 October 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the cover interior" in line 6. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

In claim 5, the limitation "a cover to receive a pouch and a fluid container" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear how the cover receives the pouch and the fluid container. It appears to Examiner that the cover includes a pouch, wherein the fluid container is received in the pouch. For examination it will be treated as noted by Examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hall et al. (US 2002/0179647).

Hall discloses a portable flexible carrier 110 comprising: an inner flexible fluid container 520 entirely encase within an outer separable cover 510, the outer cover being produced from a chemically hardened fluorinated polymer material (paragraph 30) that is impermeable to chemical toxins and biological agents; a drinking tube 130 connected to an opening of the container, and wherein the tube is formed from an inner and outer layer, such that a conduit layer is defined along the entire length of the tube, the conduit layer also being made from a fluorinated polymer (paragraph 31, lines 11-13); an on/off valve 150 on the tube for controlling the fluid flow; and a means 120/122 for selectively sealing the cover interior and its contents from the atmosphere.

Hall does not disclose the conduit and the outer separable cover being made from the same chemically hardened material which is impermeable to radioactive particles. However, the material 3TOX is a chemically hardened material that is well known in the art to be used in protecting against toxins, biological agents, and radioactive particles. As Hall teaches the general concept of a drinking container with an outer cover and a conduit which are made from a material that is impermeable to chemical toxins and biological agents, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to have made the outer cover 520 and the outer conduit layer of the drinking tube 130 from the material 3TOX. It has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416.

Regarding claim 2, the material 3TOX is a chemically hardened material similar to that discloses by Hall which is composed of a multi-layer material having a fabric

support (paragraph 30, line 11) that is covered by a protective complex (paragraph 30, lines 13-15).

5. Claims 3-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hall et al. in view of Fawcett (US 5,803,333). Hall et al. discloses the claimed invention but does not have shoulder straps or a sealable flap. However, Fawcett teaches a pouch 10 for carrying a bladder 48 similar to that of Hall et al., and wherein the pouch includes shoulder straps 46, and a selectively sealable flap 20 to overlie an end of the pouch. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to carry the bladder of Hall et al. in the Fawcett device in order to provide easy transportation.

6. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fawcett (US 5,803,333) in view of Fawcett (US 5,085,349) and Hall et al. (US 2002/0179647).

Fawcett '333 discloses a portable flexible carrier 10 substantially as claimed including: a cover 14/16 defining a pouch 12 which encases and receives a fluid container 48; a flap 20 disposed at the cover to substantially encase the top portion of the pouch, a second seal 42/44 being disposed on the flap to detachably couple the flap to the front of the cover; a tube 50 with a first and a second end extending from the cover, the first end received by the fluid container, and the tube being made from a flexible material; a valve 52 disposed at the second end of the tube; and shoulder straps 46 disposed at the cover. Fawcett '333 does not have the cover made from a chemically hardened material, a first seal at the pouch, and a tube conduit made from the same chemically hardened material.

However, Fawcett '349 teaches a similar cover 16 defining a pouch for carrying a fluid container 30, wherein the upper end of the pouch has a first seal 25 for selectively sealing the pouch. As such, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to provide the pouch of Fawcett '333 with a first sealing means at the top of the pouch as taught by Fawcett '349 in order to better secure the fluid container within the pouch.

Furthermore, Hall teaches a hydration system with a fluid container 110 and a tube 130, wherein the hydration system is made from select outer layers so as to protect the carried fluid from harmful chemical toxins and biological agents. This is accomplished by an outer bladder 510 made from a chemically hardened material as claimed, and by an outer conduit layer along the length of the tube which made from a fluorinated polymer (paragraph 31, lines 11-13). As Hall teaches the general concept of a drinking container with an outer cover and a conduit which are made from a material that is impermeable to chemical toxins and biological agents, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to have provided a conduit on the tube of Fawcett '333 and to have made the cover and conduit from any well known material that is impermeable to chemical toxins, and biological agents (i.e. 3TOX), in order to provide a safe means for transporting drinking fluids.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 10/26/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant has argued that the cited Hall reference does not teach an

outer separable cover, a conduit encasing a tube, and means for selectively sealing the cover interior. In particular Applicant has argued that the outer protective bladder 510 cannot be considered separable from the inner bladder 520 because of spout 120. However, as Applicant points out on page 8 lines 8-11 of the response "the inner bladder cannot be separated from the outer protective bladder without disassembling the spout 120", which essentially states that the inner bladder can be separated from the outer protective bladder by disassembling the spout, and as such, Examiner is considering to inner and outer bladders to be separable. Regarding Applicant argument that Hall does not disclose the tube encased within a conduit, Examiner maintains that as the drinking tube is disclosed being made from multiple layers, the outer protective layer may be considered a conduit which encases a drinking tube (the inner layer). Regarding Applicants argument that Hall does not disclose a means for sealing the cover interior, Examiner maintains his position that the spout 120/122 clearly acts as a means for sealing the cover interior, as shown in Figure 1.

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 5 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Corey N. Skurdal whose telephone number is 571-272-9588. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 8am-4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Newhouse can be reached on 571-272-4544. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

CNS

2/7/2008

/Nathan J. Newhouse/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3782